

1a. Impact on P-12 Learning and Development

HEDI Ratings								
Lehman College 2018-2019 Graduates from Initial Programs								
Initial Programs	Total in DOE	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective	C	S	No Rating
Art Graduate	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bilingual Extension - Special Education	6	1	4	0	0	0	1	0
Childhood Education	8	0	3	0	0	0	1	4
Counselor Education	5	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Early Childhood	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	8
English Education	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
English Education Teaching Fellows	14	2	11	0	0	0	0	1
Foreign Language UG	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Health Education	4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
History UG	3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Math Education Graduate	6	1	4	0	0	0	0	1
Math Education Teaching Fellows	9	1	8	0	0	0	0	0
Minor to Masters	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Music Graduate	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Science Education	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Science Education Graduate	4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Science Education Teaching Fellows	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	0
Social Studies Education	5	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Special Ed. Adolescent	6	0	5	0	0	0	1	0
Special Ed. Childhood	8	2	4	0	0	0	0	2
Special Ed. Early Childhood	12	3	5	0	0	1	0	3
Special Education Gifted Education	7	1	6	0	0	0	0	0
TESOL	15	3	11	0	0	1	0	0
TESOL Teaching Fellows	24	0	23	0	0	0	1	0
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>31</b>

HEDI Ratings								
Lehman College 2018-2019 Graduates from Advanced Programs								
Advanced Programs	Total in DOE	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective	C	S	No Rating
Ed. Leadership	14	3	5	0	0	0	3	3
Literacy	6	2	3	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>

\* - data hidden for programs with 5 or fewer graduates.

\*\* - According to Engage NY, HEDI Ratings (Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective) are given during a series of two observations, one of which must be unannounced. The Measure of Teacher Practice (MOTP) score which contains 8 components of the Danielson Framework as shown in table below. An individual component rating is given for each observable evidence and shared on an Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Teacher Observation Report. Finally, the MOTP score is converted into a HEDI rating. HEDI rating constitute both an instrument for teaching Effectiveness and Impact on Student learning. Danielson Items in Domains 2 and 3 are all measures on the Impact on Student Learning and make up 85% of the MOTP. This represents the best independently mined data on the impact on student learning since principals are specially well trained to evaluate teachers using Danielson, which is the basis for New York City DOE Criteria for New Teacher Readiness (CNTR), also aligned with Lehman College Student Evaluation Form (STEF).

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation	Domain 2: The Classroom Environment	Domain 3: Instruction	Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities
1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy  1e: Designing Coherent Instruction	2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport  2d: Managing Student Behavior	3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques  3c: Engaging Students in Learning  3d: Using Assessment in Instruction	4e: Growing and Developing Professionally

Legend: S-Satisfactory; U-Unsatisfactory; C-On Leave; N-Unavailable

Notes: Dataset includes graduates from School of Education Educator Preparation programs for June 1, 2018, September 1, 2018 and February 1, 2019. Of the 323 SOE graduates reported in the dataset, 243 of them were in the DOE database. Of the 243 graduates in the DOE database, 179 are currently working in the DOE. Of the 179, 159 are from Initial Programs and 20 are from Advanced Programs.

**Ib. Impact on P-12 Learning and Development**  
Alumni Survey

Initial Programs																														
APPR: What was your APPR Principal Ratings in 2016-2017, 2017-2018 and 2018-2019? (Fill in table below. Put N/A if not available) (Optional)																														
	2018-2019										2017-2018						2016-2017													
	Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective		No Response		Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective		No Response		Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Childhood Education, Grades 1-6 (Graduate)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%
Counselor Education	1	6%	5	31%	1	6%	1	6%	8	50%	1	6%	4	25%	1	6%	1	6%	9	56%	1	6%	4	25%	1	6%	1	0	9	56%
Early Childhood Education, Birth-Grade 2 (Graduate)	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0	1	50%
Math Education, 7-12 (Graduate)	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0	1	50%
Organizational leadership	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0	1	100%
Science Education, 7-12 (Graduate)	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0	1	50%
Special Education Childhood, Grades 1-6	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0	1	100%
Special Education Early Childhood, Birth-Grade 2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0	0	0%
Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0	0	0%

Advanced Programs																														
APPR: What was your APPR Principal Ratings in 2016-2017, 2017-2018 and 2018-2019? (Fill in table below. Put N/A if not available) (Optional)																														
	2018-2019										2017-2018						2016-2017													
	Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective		No Response		Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective		No Response		Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Educational Leadership	0	0%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	6	86%	0	0%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	6	86%	0	0%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0	6	86%

Notes:  
Alumni Survey administered to graduates of 2018-2019. Data gathered from Question 19 of the Alumni Survey.  
Initial Programs N=28; Advanced Programs N=7

2a. Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

HEDI Ratings								
Lehman College 2018-2019 Graduates from Initial Programs								
Initial Programs	Total in DOE	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective	C	S	No Rating
Art Graduate	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Bilingual Extension - Special Education	6	1	4	0	0	0	1	0
Childhood Education	8	0	3	0	0	0	1	4
Counselor Education	5	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Early Childhood	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	8
English Education	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
English Education Teaching Fellows	14	2	11	0	0	0	0	1
Foreign Language UG	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Health Education	4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
History UG	3	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Math Education Graduate	6	1	4	0	0	0	0	1
Math Education Teaching Fellows	9	1	8	0	0	0	0	0
Minor to Masters	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Music Graduate	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Science Education	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Science Education Graduate	4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Science Education Teaching Fellows	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	0
Social Studies Education	5	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Special Ed. Adolescent	6	0	5	0	0	0	1	0
Special Ed. Childhood	8	2	4	0	0	0	0	2
Special Ed. Early Childhood	12	3	5	0	0	1	0	3
Special Education Gifted Education	7	1	6	0	0	0	0	0
TESOL	15	3	11	0	0	1	0	0
TESOL Teaching Fellows	24	0	23	0	0	0	1	0
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>31</b>

HEDI Ratings								
Lehman College 2018-2019 Graduates from Advanced Programs								
Advanced Programs	Total in DOE	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective	C	S	No Rating
Ed. Leadership	14	3	5	0	0	0	3	3
Literacy	6	2	3	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>

\* - data hidden for programs with 5 or fewer graduates.

\*\* - According to Engage NY, HEDI Ratings (Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective) are given during a series of two observations, one of which must be unannounced. The Measure of Teacher Practice (MOTP) score which contains 8 components of the Danielson Framework as shown in table below. An individual component rating is given for each observable evidence and shared on an Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Teacher Observation Report. Finally, the MOTP score is converted into a HEDI rating. HEDI rating constitute both an instrument for teaching Effectiveness and Impact on Student learning. Danielson Items in Domains 2 and 3 are all measures on the Impact on Student Learning and make up 85% of the MOTP. This represents the best independently mined data on the impact on student learning since principals are specially well trained to evaluate teachers using Danielson, which is the basis for New York City DOE Criteria for New Teacher Readiness (CNTR), also aligned with Lehman College Student Evaluation Form (STEF).

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation	Domain 2: The Classroom Environment	Domain 3: Instruction	Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities
1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques	4e: Growing and Developing Professionally
1e: Designing Coherent Instruction	2d: Managing Student Behavior	3c: Engaging Students in Learning 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction	

Legend: S-Satisfactory; U-Unsatisfactory; C-On Leave; N-Unavailable

Notes: Dataset includes graduates from School of Education Educator Preparation programs for June 1, 2018, September 1, 2018 and February 1, 2019. Of the 323 SOE graduates reported in the dataset, 243 of them were in the DOE database. Of the 243 graduates in the DOE database, 179 are currently working in the DOE. Of the 179, 159 are from Initial Programs and 20 are from Advanced Programs.

**2b. Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness**  
Alumni Survey

Initial Programs																														
APPR: What was your APPR Principal Ratings in 2016-2017, 2017-2018 and 2018-2019? (Fill in table below. Put N/A if not available) (Optional)																														
	2018-2019										2017-2018						2016-2017													
	Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective		No Response		Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective		No Response		Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Childhood Education, Grades 1-6 (Graduate)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%
Counselor Education	1	6%	5	31%	1	6%	1	6%	8	50%	1	6%	4	25%	1	6%	1	6%	9	56%	1	6%	4	25%	1	6%	1	0	9	56%
Early Childhood Education, Birth-Grade 2 (Graduate)	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0	1	50%
Math Education, 7-12 (Graduate)	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0	1	50%
Organizational leadership	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0	1	100%
Science Education, 7-12 (Graduate)	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0	1	50%
Special Education Childhood, Grades 1-6	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0	1	100%
Special Education Early Childhood, Birth-Grade 2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0	0	0%
Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0	0	0%

Advanced Programs																														
APPR: What was your APPR Principal Ratings in 2016-2017, 2017-2018 and 2018-2019? (Fill in table below. Put N/A if not available) (Optional)																														
	2018-2019										2017-2018						2016-2017													
	Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective		No Response		Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective		No Response		Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Educational Leadership	0	0%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	6	86%	0	0%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	6	86%	0	0%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0	6	86%

Notes:  
Alumni Survey administered to graduates of 2018-2019. Data gathered from Question 19 of the Alumni Survey.  
Initial Programs N=28; Advanced Programs N=7

2c. Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

Employer Survey 2020								
How satisfied are you with Lehman graduates' ability to figure out ways to teach challenging content to students.								
	Rating							
	Dissatisfied		Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Total Count	Total %
Position	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%		
Advanced		0%	3	100%		0%	3	100%
Initial	1	4%	13	50%	12	46%	26	100%
Unknown		0%		0%	2	100%	2	100%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>
<i>Note 1</i>	<i>Of the 31 respondents, there were 26 principals, 4 assistant principals and 1 advance teacher instructional specialist. Positions have been combined.</i>							
<i>Note 2</i>	<i>Survey administered to LC SOE graduates from 2017-2018 who are working within the Department of Education as of the 2019-2020 AY.</i>							

### 3. Satisfaction of Employers

Employer Survey 2020								
How would you rate your overall satisfaction with Lehman graduates?								
	Rating							
	Dissatisfied		Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Total Count	Total %
Position	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%		
Advanced		0%	2	67%	1	33%	3	100%
Initial	1	4%	11	42%	14	54%	26	100%
Unknown		0%		0%	2	100%	2	100%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>
<i>Note 1</i>	<i>Of the 31 respondents, there were 26 principals, 4 assistant principals and 1 advance teacher instructional specialist. Positions have been combined.</i>							
<i>Note 2</i>	<i>Survey administered to LC SOE graduates from 2017-2018 who are working within the Department of Education as of the 2019-2020 AY.</i>							

#### 4. Satisfaction of Completers

##### Alumni Survey

Initial Programs						
How would you rate your overall satisfaction with the Educator Preparation Program at Lehman College?						
	No Response		Satisfied		Very Satisfied	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Childhood Education, Grades 1-6 (Graduate)	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%
Counselor Education	1	6%	3	19%	12	75%
Early Childhood Education, Birth-Grade 2 (Graduate)	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%
Math Education, 7-12 (Graduate)	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%
Organizational leadership	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Science Education, 7-12 (Graduate)	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%
Special Education Childhood, Grades 1-6	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Special Education Early Childhood, Birth-Grade 2	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%

Advanced Programs				
How would you rate your overall satisfaction with the Educator Preparation Program at Lehman College?				
	Satisfied		Very Satisfied	
	N	%	N	%
Educational Leadership	1	14%	6	86%

*Notes:*

*Alumni Survey administered to graduates of 2018-2019. Data gathered from Question 37 of the Alumni Survey.*

*Initial Programs N=28; Advanced Programs N=7*

## 5. Graduation Rates

Graduation Rates by Initial/Advanced Programs, 2019-2020						
	Type					
	Advanced		Initial		Total N	Total %
Years at Lehman	N	%	N	%		
0	2	4%	2	0%	4	1%
1		0%	88	18%	88	16%
2	27	48%	142	29%	169	31%
3	5	9%	97	20%	102	19%
4	4	7%	50	10%	54	10%
5	3	5%	41	8%	44	8%
6	5	9%	29	6%	34	6%
7	3	5%	13	3%	16	3%
8	4	7%	11	2%	15	3%
9		0%	7	1%	7	1%
10	2	4%	3	1%	5	1%
11	1	2%	1	0%	2	0%
12		0%	1	0%	1	0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>485</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>100%</b>

*Notes: Data gathered from 2019-2020 Title II Report. Advanced Programs include the Master's degree programs in Educational Leadership and Literacy Studies.*



## 6. Certification Rates

	Status					
	Certified		Not Certified		Total Count	Total %
Programs	Count	%	Count	%		
Advanced	15	27%	41	73%	56	100%
Initial	170	40%	257	60%	427	100%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>100%</b>

*Notes:*

*There were 541 completers, 58 were not in a program leading to certification for the 2019-2020 academic year.*

*Due to Covid-19, completers could not take state certification exams, (CST, EAS, edTPA). Consequently, many students could not complete the certification process on time, which lead to a lower certification rate for the 2019-2020 completers.*

**7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared.**

Milestones for Graduates from Initial Programs 2018-2019						
SOE Grad in DOE	Yes					
SOE Grad Currently Working in DOE	Yes					
	Milestones	Data				
	# of Years in NYCDOE Schools >3 Years		# of Years in NYCDOE Schools <3 Years		Total N	Total %
Programs	N	%	N	%		
Art Graduate		0%	1	100%	1	100%
Art History Early Childhood UG	1	100%		0%	1	100%
Bilingual Extension - Special Education	4	80%	1	20%	5	100%
Childhood Education	2	18%	9	82%	11	100%
Counselor Education	4	80%	1	20%	5	100%
Early Childhood	1	11%	8	89%	9	100%
Early Childhood UG	2	67%	1	33%	3	100%
English Education	2	67%	1	33%	3	100%
English Education Teaching Fellows	4	29%	10	71%	14	100%
English Education UG	1	100%		0%	1	100%
Foreign Language UG		0%	2	100%	2	100%
Health Education	2	50%	2	50%	4	100%
History UG		0%	4	100%	4	100%
Math Education Graduate	4	67%	2	33%	6	100%
Math Education Teaching Fellows	6	67%	3	33%	9	100%
Minor to Masters		0%	1	100%	1	100%
Music Graduate		0%	1	100%	1	100%
Science Education Graduate	1	17%	5	83%	6	100%
Science Education Teaching Fellows	1	17%	5	83%	6	100%
Social Studies Education	1	20%	4	80%	5	100%
Special Ed. Adolescent	3	50%	3	50%	6	100%
Special Ed. Early Childhood	2	20%	8	80%	10	100%
Special Education	6	100%		0%	6	100%
Special Education Childhood	1	11%	8	89%	9	100%
TESOL	10	91%	1	9%	11	100%
TESOL Teaching Fellows	3	13%	21	88%	24	100%
Grand Total	61	37%	102	63%	163	100%

Milestones for Graduates from Initial Programs 2018-2019						
SOE Grad in DOE	Yes					
SOE Grad Currently Working in DOE	Yes					
	Milestones	Data				
	# of Years in NYCDOE Schools >3 Years		# of Years in NYCDOE Schools <3 Years		Total N	Total %
Programs	N	%	N	%		
Educational Leadership	10	100%		0%	10	100%
Literacy	4	67%	2	33%	6	100%
Grand Total	14	88%	2	13%	16	100%

*Notes: Dataset includes graduates from School of Education Educator Preparation programs for June 1, 2018, September 1, 2018 and February 1, 2019. Of the 323 SOE graduates reported in the dataset, 243 of them were in the DOE database. Of the 243 graduates in the DOE database, 179 are currently working in the DOE. Of the 179, 163 are from Initial Programs and 16 are from Advanced Programs. Advanced Programs include the Master's degree programs in Educational Leadership and Literacy Studies. Data was disaggregated by Educator Preparation program.*

**8. Student Loan Default Rates and Other Consumer Information**

## Student Loan Default Rate at Lehman College

Fiscal Year	Status	# in Default	# in Repayment	Default Rate
2016	Official	102	1,816	5.6
2015	Official	113	1,707	6.6
2014	Official	123	1,810	6.7

*Note: Student loan default rate calculated for Herbert H. Lehman College, data disaggregated by School is unavailable on the Federal Student Aid website and from Lehman College.*

*Note: As explained on the Federal Student Aid website: "ENROLLMENT: To provide context for the Cohort Default Rate (CDR) data we include enrollment data (students enrolled at any time during the year) and a corresponding percentage (borrowers entering repayment divided by that enrollment figure). While there is no direct relationship between the timing of when a borrower entered repayment (October 1 through September 30) and any particular enrollment year, for the purpose of these data, we have chosen to use the academic year ending on the June 30 prior to the beginning of the cohort year (e.g., FY 2016 CDR Year will use 2014-2015 enrollment)."*